

Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies And Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy Orientation Webinar Briefing Session Summaries

**March 19, 2013
9:30 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.**

**March 21, 2013
3:00 p.m. to 4:35 p.m.**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) conducted two orientation briefings, with the same agenda, on March 19, 2013 and again on March 21, 2013. The goal was to provide interested parties an overview of the approach and next steps for the Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies (BWFS) and Central Valley Flood System Conservation Strategy (Conservation Strategy). Conducted via webinar, 171 attendees logged in between the two sessions, (100 in briefing 1 and 71 in briefing 2), with at least several registrants known to be viewing the sessions with others in conference rooms and other locations. Attendee lists for the May 19 and 21 meetings are located on Pages 9 and 10, respectively.

Presenters Jeremy Arrich, Marc Hoshovsky and Todd Bernardy of DWR welcomed participants to the session then covered the following topics:

- Overview & Background - Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) and the Conservation Strategy
- Integrated Water Management Approach
- Scope of the BWFS
- BWFS Development Approach
- Scope and Strategy Development approach of the Conservation Strategy
- Integration of the BWFS, Conservation Strategy, and Regional Flood Management Planning
- Communications & Engagement

Following each major section of the agenda, attendees were invited to pose questions, on-line, to the presenters. Following is a combined summary of the questions, comments, and responses, by subject. Where noted with an asterisk, the response was augmented with additional correspondence following the meeting. To view the presentation and hear audio of the May 19 meeting, visit the Meetings page of the Central Valley Flood Management Program website at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/meetings/>. Due to technical difficulties, audio for the May 21 meeting was not captured.

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

Attendee questions and comments included the following topics:

- Study Questions, Tools, Metrics
- Investments/ Costs
- System, Flood System Improvements, Now and in the Future
- State Systemwide Investment Approach (SSIA)
- Integration and Collaboration with Other Agencies and Studies
- Regional Planning
- Multiple Uses, Benefits and Needs
- Funding
- Conservation Strategy
- Other

Study Questions, Tools, Metrics

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
How were the analysis tools selected? How does use/selection of the tools relate to the study questions?	The structured study approach uses a process referred to as Tools, Plans, Actions, and Results (TPAR). Tools inform thoughtful planning, but it's not always as simple as the order presented. The tools fit into multiple areas and support planning and implementation actions.
When will goals and metrics for ecosystem restoration be published?	Two technical public workshops are planned to discuss these topics in 2013.
Will the BWFS look specifically at moderate and low intensity floods that affect ecosystem or just focus on larger floods that pose the greatest risk?	The BWFS will focus on larger storm events for the purpose of flood risk reduction, but also smaller floods that support important ecosystem processes.
Will the feasibility studies include an EIR?	A program-level EIR was prepared for the 2012 CVFPP and the BWFS and Conservation Strategy are anticipated to stay within that. Additional environmental review will be initiated, if needed.
Planning Objectives for the BWFS include providing an Urban Level of Protection (i.e. 200-year) for urban and urbanizing areas. Will a 200-year flood protection plan be developed for each major urban area in the Central Valley?	Not necessarily, DWR will rely on the Regional Flood Management Plans (RFMP) and local planning entities to determine their own priorities on regional projects and actions to achieve urban level of flood protections. DWR will coordinate with RFMP partners and provide assistance if necessary.*

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

Investments/Costs

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
How will funds be allocated among various objectives, for example the relative investments for ecosystem objectives relative to the levee improvement projects?	Allocations will be refined through the BWFS. The study approach looks at what we want to do, and how much that will cost. Ecosystem objectives can't be developed without looking at levee improvement projects, and vice-versa. This needs to be and will be done in an integrated way.

System, Flood System Improvements Now and in the Future

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
What specific flood improvements are going on right now?	A number of ongoing State, federal, and Central Valley Flood Protection Board sponsored efforts and studies are in progress. DWR has funded a number of early implementation projects (EIP), including levee improvements in urban areas and critical repairs. There are also "near term" projects going on. Planning activities will not get in the way of ongoing projects and flood risk reduction processes.
How will DWR select what flood improvement projects get implemented?	DWR's planning activities will help refine the State Systemwide Investment Approach and make recommendations, but will not direct funding to specific projects. Planning will support long-term FloodSAFE financing strategies and grant programs in the near term to direct remaining bond funds. Beyond that, we need long term sustainable financing.
Are the BWFS going to include potential improvements to the non-State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) facilities?	The SPFC represents a portion of the Central Valley flood management system for which the State has special responsibilities, as defined in the California Water Code. The BWFS considers pertinent facilities which contribute to the protection of the SPFC.

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

Have you determined what - and if the system needs increased capacity?	A need for increased capacity was identified in the 2012 CVFPP. Climate change and changing hydrologic conditions are potential factors in increasing the severity and frequency of flood events. The need for increased capacity is widely recognized, and will be studied carefully along with other system improvements during the Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies process.
What are the "system improvement features" in Phase 1?	System Improvement features provide cross-regional benefits – including bypasses, reservoir re-operation, etcetera. When we consider these features, we are discussing improvements to the overall flood system function, flexibility, and resiliency.

State Systemwide Investment Approach (SSIA)

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
The BWFS process includes development of objectives, plan formulation, and selection of a preferred plan. So does this mean the door is being re-opened on the State Systemwide Investment Approach (SSIA)? There's a slide in the presentation that shows "Phase 1, Phase 2" that seems to imply a return to square 1 in the planning process. But during the discussion the BWFS is described as more of a SSIA refinement process.	DWR is implementing the SSIA, and the BWFS are filling in the details and making refinements. Because the BWFS are refinements, it is not a return to square one of the planning process. In this next phase of work, we go above and beyond the 2012 CVFPP.

Integration and Collaboration with Other Agencies and Studies

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
There were multiple questions regarding coordination with other agencies and planning efforts.	The BWFS/Conservation Strategy team is coordinating with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on study approach and sharing information and with FEMA on floodplain management, and it meets monthly with state and federal natural resource agencies (Interagency Advisory Committee). The team is also involved in and/or consulting with multiple other projects and

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
	planning efforts such as the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, including the OCAP Biological Opinion reasonable prudent action implementation, Habitat Conservation planning efforts, the California Water Plan, etc. Where feasible, the team is looking at collaborative planning. The team is also taking into account and monitoring system improvements already being addressed in State/federal studies such as the Folsom Dam modification and Sac Weir and Bypass widening in the Sacramento/West Sacramento General Reevaluation Report, as well as the Paradise Cut Bypass in the Lower San Joaquin River Feasibility Study.*
Why not wait to do the BWFS until after the Regional Flood Management Plans (RFMP) have been completed? Seems like there will be a lot of duplicated work. The RFMP will identify the projects that the locals want.	These are parallel efforts that are closely coordinating. BWFS are focusing on system improvements while regional planning focuses on local and regional flood improvements. It is an “and/both” approach.
How will synergies between flood control facilities and ecosystem restoration be identified?	DWR will be incorporating environmental improvements into the design of systemwide flood improvement projects. DWR will also be working with RFMP teams to help them develop similar integrated, multi-objective projects at the regional level.

Regional Planning

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
Is Integrated Water Management (IWM) the same as Integrated REGIONAL Water Management (IRWM)?	IWM is a broad, DWR-initiative to integrate and coordinate multiple programs, including IRWM. Other DWR programs include the State Water Plan and FloodSAFE activities. . DWR is hosting conferences, an IWM Summit on April 3, (www.iwmsummit.org) and an IRWM Conference on April 4-5, (www.irwmconference.org). For more information view the listed Web sites.*

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

Multiple Uses, Benefits and Needs

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
What are the benefits being considered? Will rural areas have any potential benefits?	Rural benefits include life safety, regional economic, and ecosystem benefits. A benefits analysis framework will be developed that goes into more detail on the multi-benefit approach.
How will the state balance agricultural production and the conservation goals?	There are many ways that wildlife benefits can be done that benefit both agricultural production, and species conservation; for example, alfalfa production supports Swainson's Hawk. DWR is exploring a number of ways to improve landowner incentives. For example the team is working on a safe harbor program in the Upper Sacramento River.*
How will the Conservation Strategy monetize the benefits?	Conservation benefits are sometimes difficult to quantify monetarily; however, there are a variety of ways to measure benefits besides dollar value. DWR is breaking new ground in many respects, and is tackling developing systemwide benefits procedures for many different types of benefits.
Upland habitat outside of the immediate floodplain is a valuable refuge for species during flood events. Without consideration of upland habitat, wildlife would burden private property and be vulnerable to disease and the elements. Will upland habitat outside of the immediate floodplain be given consideration?	If opportunities exist to help solve the problem, then DWR will consider them.

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
The general public has rights to be on and use the (navigable) rivers and the temporarily dry land along the rivers up to the ordinary annual high water mark for recreational purposes. There is also the obligation of state agencies to refrain from unnecessarily interfering with the public's use of these rights (recreational navigable servitude and public trust doctrine). How will DWR address these rights and obligations?	A specific answer is not immediately available; however, as individual projects are evaluated the team will look for multiple benefits. Additionally there are various levels of responsibility for these rights and obligations at all levels. At the scale of the BWFS, there is not this level of detail.
What will ensure locally-led Regional Flood Management Planning efforts will follow the multi-benefit approach of the CVFPP?	DWR has issued a set of guidelines for the six regions. The guidelines include a draft project management plan (PMP), and our goal is to encourage multi-benefit projects. Future State funding decisions will consider the extent to which opportunities for restoration and other benefits are realized through local/regional projects.

Funding

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Answer(s)</i>
What are the expected benefits to the CVFPP from the Water Resources Development Act being introduced in Congress?	That is yet to be determined. The bill as introduced includes U.S. Army Corps of Engineers funding for flood improvement projects.
What type of sustainable, long-term funding will DWR seek?	The CVFPP anticipated \$14-\$17 Billion in needed financing. DWR will look at every option for future funding. This is one reason why we focus on multi-benefit projects that maximize State investment.
What efforts are in place to include flood money in 2014 water bond?	That discussion is ongoing. The FloodSAFE program office along with other DWR programs is working on future financing efforts.

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Answer(s)</i>
How will DWR and the regions finance planned improvements? What does the DWR FloodSAFE Financing Strategy/Plan consider?	Due to diminished federal funding, implementation of the CVFPP and FloodSAFE will depend on the financing capacity of the State and local entities. Other discussions on new bond funding will help inform the process in developing Financing Plans in 2014. The FloodSAFE “looking to the future” document is an implementation plan that shows the strategy for remaining bond funds.
How much will the BWFS planning cost? What are relative costs for the Conservation Strategy?	This is a complex answer as many activities will contribute towards updating the 2017 CVFPP. There isn’t a single number. The upcoming DWR FloodSAFE Accomplishments Report document will be publicly available soon, and detail some of the DWR investments. People interested in specific budget numbers should check in after the meeting for details.

Conservation Strategy

<i>Question(s) and Comment(s)</i>	<i>Response(s)</i>
Who is the DWR lead for developing the Conservation Strategy?	Marc Hoshovsky from the FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office (FESSRO) is leading the Conservation Strategy.
How does the Conservation Strategy integrate with Regional Flood Management Plans? Will the regions have final approval authority?	RFMPs are locally-led planning efforts to develop regional perspectives on integrated flood management. Staff working on the Conservation Strategy will be providing systemwide environmental information (objectives, needs and opportunities, science and planning information, and advice) to RFMP efforts as requested. RFMP can incorporate this information, if desired, to develop regional projects that also contribute to statewide objectives*
How will the Conservation Strategy be enforced at the local/regional level?	The Conservation Strategy is not an enforceable document. It is designed to guide DWR’s investment in the Central Valley, and attract broad-based public support.
Will the conservation strategy utilize Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP)?	Yes, RAMP is a part of the Conservation Strategy and a great example of advance mitigation in action.

* Response augmented, following the meeting, with additional correspondence

Other

Several questions were posed on specific topics such as how the plantings in the Colusa Bypass affected flood flow dynamics and requests for line item budget numbers. Those posing the questions were asked to connect outside of the meeting for more detailed information.

At the closing of each session, Jeremy Arrich and Marc Hoshovsky reviewed what had been covered and invited the group to stay involved. During the session 1 briefing, they also encouraged participants to forward an invitation to others they thought might be interested to the next briefing, conducted with exactly the same agenda, on March 21, 2013. They ended by thanking the attendees for their time and interest in participating.

For More Information

Meeting materials are available on the Central Valley Flood Management Program website:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/meetings/>

For information on the Regional Flood Management Plans, visit:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/regionalplan>.

March 19, 2013 Attendance

Presenters: Jeremy Arrich, Todd Bernardy and Marc Hoshovsky, DWR

Moderator Team: Lisa Beutler and Joshua Biggs (MWH)

Full list of attendees (note: names listed as entered by attendee to webinar, not corrected):

Anthony Alvarado	James Hartwig	Daniel Peterson
Cathy Avila	Greg Harvey	David Peterson
Isabel Baer	Alan Haynes	Nathan Pingel
Melody Baldwin	Brian Heiland	Mary Pitto
Andrew Bambauer	Jay Heiman	Eric Poncelet
Michelle Banonis	Mike Hendrick	Ali Porbaha
Kelley Barker	Todd Hillaire	Jay Punia
Debra Bishop	Jennifer Hobbs	Dusty Robinson
George Booth	Paul Hofmann	Harriet Ross
Mark Boucher	Jason Holley	Mark Salmon
Kristin Brainerd	Anna Holmes	Dennis Sanchez
Doug Brown	Scott Huntsman	Robert Scarborough
Richard Burgi	Mike Inamine	Scott Shapiro
Joshua Bush	Ashley Indrieri	Harry Spanglet
John Cain	Richard Kim	Susan Strachan
You Chen (Tim) Chao	Marianne Kirkland	George Strnad
Tom Chapman	Mick Klasson	Emma Suarez
Susan Clark	Jerry Lakeman	Helen Swagerty
Binta Coleman	Abimael Leon	Ernie Taylor
Francis Costs	Henry Lomeli	Scott Terrill
Joseph Countryman	Stefan Lorenzato	Melinda Terry
Steve Cowdin	James Macdonald	Suzanne Turek
Sean De Guzman	Rodney Mayer	Claire Marie Turner
Patrick Dell	Leah Mcnearney	Tim Washburn
Mike Dettinger	Sandra Morey	Terri Wegener
Karen Dove	Craig Moyle	Doug Weinrich
Doug Evans	Ken Myers	Craig Williams
Kim Floyd	Eric Nichol	Mark Wilson
Kim Forrest	Barry Oregan	Ed Winkler
Thomas Fossum	Allan Oto	Julie Wolford
Chris Fritz	Jesse Patchett	Ally Wu
Fred Gius	Connie Perkins	Greg Zlotnic
Michael Gorecki	Michael Perrone	
John Hanson	David Pesavento	

March 21, 2013 Attendance

Presenters: Jeremy Arrich, Todd Bernardy and Marc Hoshovsky, DWR

Moderator Team: Lisa Beutler and Joshua Biggs (MWH)

Full list of attendees (note: names listed as entered by attendee to webinar, not corrected):

Andrews, Betty	Farley, Greg	Osgood, Steve
Bejarano, Jacob	Forrest, Bill	Parkin, Meredith
Benigno, Gina	Gettleman, Ben	Perlea, Mary
Black-Davis, Christi...	Giottonini, Jim	Pritchard, John
Bonakdar, Hamid	Guillen, Sergio	Ragazzi, Erin
Bowles, Chris	Hertel, Meghan	Ramos, Daniel
Brunner, Paul	Hill, Jeremy	Ranade, Rahul
Buer, Stein	Hill, Reggie	Randall, Mary
Burley, Nathan	Hoang, Tan	Reinhard, Hilary
Carlson, Dave	Hollender, Laura	Rice, Scott
Carter, Denise	Hong, Eric	Salisbury, Lance
Cecil, Frank	Huntsman, Scott	Schuetz, Jeff
Chainey, Steve	Jaffe, David	Seligman, Keith
Chao, You Chen	Joc, Foc	Shadley, Martin...
Chowdhury, Shyamal	Kiger, Luana	Spanos, Katherine
Cimperman, Steve	Labrie, Gilbert	Steffan, Carolyn
Cocke, Mark	Ly, Hoa	Stygar, Shem
Connelly, Mark	Lynch, Anne	Sweesy, Michael
Constancio, Sherry	Maguire, John	Tabor, Ward
Coulton, Kevin	Marr, Jenny	Talanki, Sudhakar
Danna, Jack	McCreary, Jeff	Teal, Martin
Denzler, Sara	McManus, Dan	Vink, Erik
Dolan, Jane	Mierzwa, Michael	
Echols, Kayl	Mraz, Davie	